

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/082,498	02/22/2002	Robert Fransdonk	5782P007	3732
21186	7590 06/16/2005		EXAMINER	
	IAN, LUNDBERG, W	WINTER, JOHN M		
P.O. BOX 2938 MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0938			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3621	•

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/082,498	FRANSDONK, ROBERT			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	John M. Winter	3621			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 M	<u>arch 2005</u> .	1			
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowar	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is				
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-45</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
5)☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-13,16-28 and 31-43</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) <u>14,15,29,30,44 and 45</u> is/are objected	I to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine	г.				
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acce		Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the					
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct		• •			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		•			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
<u> </u>		. (4) (0)			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:	phonty under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)	)-(a) or (t).			
· · <u>· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · </u>	s have been received	•			
		on No			
<ul><li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents</li><li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior</li></ul>					
application from the International Bureau		ed in this National Stage			
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list	` ','	ad.			
and an analysis and assessing a list	2 23 34 30 plos flot 1000lVC	·•·			
		·			
Attachment(s)					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary				
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  Paper No(s)/Mail Date  5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)					
Paper No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:				
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 1-04) Office Ac	tion Summary Pa	rt of Paper No./Mail Date 20050713			

Art Unit: 3621

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

#### **STATUS**

Claims 1-45 are pending.

## Response to Arguments

The Applicant's arguments filed on March 3, 2005 have been fully considered.

The indicated allowability of claims 1-18 and 24-28 is withdrawn in view of the newly discovered reference to Coley et al. (US Patent 5,790,664) in view of Clark (US Patent 6,343,280). Rejections based on the newly cited reference follows. The Examiner apologized for the delay in the discovery of this new art.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-13,16-28 and 31-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Narasimhaul et al (US Patent 5,499,298)

As per claim 1,

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses

Transmitting a license from a server to a secure device for storage, the license containing a product key of watercrypted content and a client identifier (Figure 2, Column 5, lines 35-50 [the header of the COIN structure contains a signature field equivalent to a client identifier ])

Transmitting via electronic network an entitlement control message containing content keys associated with said watercrypted content to said secure device (Column 6, lines 46-50; Figure 3)

Receiving said session content key from said secure device in response to said request together with a request to provide a session content key from content key, said session content key to be used to decrypt said watercrypted content (Column 7, lines 61-67; column 8 lines 1-23)

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the claimed invention except for "plurality of content keys", It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a plurality of content keys, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

Art Unit: 3621

Claims 16, 31 and 33 are in parallel with claim 1 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 2,

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the method according to claim 1, wherein said license is encrypted with a public key of said secure device to allow said secure device to access said license (Column 6, lines 1-14)

Claims 17 and 34 are in parallel with claim 2 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 3,

The method according to claim 1, wherein said license is encrypted with a secret key of said secure device to allow said secure device to access said license(Column 6, lines 1-14)

Claims 18 and 35 are in parallel with claim 3 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 4,

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the method according to claim 1,

further comprising establishing a secure channel to communicate securely with secure device (Figure 3, Column 7, lines 4-10)

Claims 19 and 36 are in parallel with claim 4 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 5

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the method according to claim 4, wherein said establishing further comprises:

encrypting a transport key with a personal public key, transmitting said transport key to said secure device(Column 6, lines 1-14)

Claim 20 and 37 are in parallel with claim 5 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 6

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the method according to claim 4, wherein said receiving further comprises:

Receiving said session content key encrypted with said transport key, decrypting said session content key to be used in decrypting said watercrypted content (Column 6, lines 1-14).

Claims 21 and 38 are in parallel with claim 6 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

Art Unit: 3621

As per claim 7

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the method according to claim 1 wherein said secure device is a smart card device (Column 6, lines 66-67; column 7 lines 1-10)

Claims 22 and 39 are in parallel with claim 7 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 8

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the method according to claim 1 further comprising: Receiving said license from a content server which distributed said watercrypted content (Column 6, lines 1-14)

Claims 23 and 40 are in parallel with claim 8 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 9

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the method according to claim 1 further comprising. Receiving said license from a content server which distributed said watercrypted content, said entity storing a client identifier and being configured to encrypt said product key with a public key of said secure device (Column 6, lines 1-14)

Claims 24 and 41 are in parallel with claim 9 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 10

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the method according to claim 1 further comprising: Receiving said entitlement control message from a content server which distributed said watercrypted material (Column 6, lines 1-14)

Claims 25 and 42 are in parallel with claim 10 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 11,

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses

Electronically storing a license containing a product key of a watercrypted content and a client identifier from a decoder. (Figure 2, Column 5, lines 35-50 [the header of the COIN structure contains a signature field equivalent to a client identifier ])

Receiving via electronic network an entitlement control message containing content keys associated with said watercrypted content from said decoder (Column 6, lines 46-50; Figure 3)

together with a request to provide a session content key from content key, said session content key to be used to decrypt said watercrypted content, selecting said session content key using said product key and said client identifier from said license. (Column 7, lines 61-67; column 8 lines 1-23)

Art Unit: 3621

transmitting Receiving said session content key from said secure device in response to said request.

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the claimed invention except for "plurality of content keys", It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use a plurality of content keys, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8.

Claims 16, 31 and 33 are in parallel with claim 1 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 12

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the method according to claim 11 wherein said license is encrypted with a personal public key to allow access to said license (Column 6, lines 1-14)

Claims 27 and 43 are in parallel with claim 12 and are rejected for at least the same reasons.

As per claim 13

Narasimhalu et al. ('298) discloses the method according to claim 11 wherein said license is encrypted with a personal public key to allow access to said license (Column 6, lines 1-14)

Claim 27 is in parallel with claim 12 and is rejected for at least the same reasons.

# Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 14, 15, 29, 30 44 and 45 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

#### Conclusion

Examiners note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Art Unit: 3621

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Winter whose telephone number is (571) 272-6713. The Examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday, 9:30am-5:00pm. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Examiner's supervisor, James Trammell can be reached at (571) 272-6712.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <a href="http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair">http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair</a>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). Any response to this action should be mailed to:

### **Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks**

# Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 305-7687	[Official communications; including After Final communications labeled
"Box AF"]	
(703) 308-1396	[Informal/Draft communications, labeled "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT"]

Hand delivered responses should be brought to the Examiner in the Knox Building, 50 Dulany St. Alexandria, VA.

JMW June 11, 2005

ALVATORE CANGIALOS
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 222